

crime we are talking about, the violent crime, is really heavily concentrated in certain areas. Princeton Prof. John DeJulio reports that while Philadelphia—just as an example—while Philadelphia contains only 14 percent of the population of the State of Pennsylvania, it accounts for 42 percent of the entire State's crime—an unbelievable figure. What is happening to the children who live in these high-crime areas? They are living a life, frankly, that would be unimaginable for Americans of my parents' generation.

Over 25 percent of inner-city children growing up in this country think they are likely to be shot at some point in their life—25 percent, one-fourth of these children growing up. A male teenager growing up in an inner city is at least six times more likely to be a victim of violent crime than a male teenager growing up somewhere else in the country—six times. I do not think we can give up on these young people, these young Americans. They need hope and opportunity every bit as much as any other child in this country. They need a chance. And I believe putting more police in their neighborhoods is something we can do to start giving them that chance, the chance to live without constant fear for themselves and for their families.

Let us make no mistake about it, putting more police into those crime-infested areas, the most crime-ridden areas of our country, is not going to solve all the problems of those communities. We all know that and we all have an obligation to work on the other problems—welfare reform, jobs, making sure the schools in every neighborhood in this country are good schools so the children do in fact have a chance and opportunity. But no matter what we do with our schools, no matter what we do with welfare, no matter what we do with job creation, nothing positive can really take place as long as crime does exist.

So, having community policing, having law enforcement targeted to these areas, I believe, is clearly the right thing to do. I do not think it is fair to say to that child who, because of accident of birth, happens to be growing up in an area where he or she is six times more likely to be killed than a child in a suburb, I do not think it is fair to say to that child: We cannot do anything about it. We are, for political reasons, going to spread out these police officers, these new police men and women. We are going to spread them out throughout the country because for political reasons we think we can get more votes that way for a particular bill. I do not think that is right. I think the right thing to do is to target where these police men and women go, and that is what our bill does.

Our bill does many other things. I see my colleague from Michigan is on the floor, so I am not going to speak very much longer, let me advise him. But let me say in conclusion that this bill is aimed at doing things that matter,

doing things that will make a difference, doing things that will get the job done. It is a very pragmatic bill, a very hardheaded bill. And it basically says this: If we as a Congress have made the decision, as apparently we have, that over the next 5 years we are going to spend \$30 billion on this very, very important problem, then we should spend it correctly and we should listen to the men and women who are professionals, who can tell us how to spend it: More technology, more police officers deployed correctly, and finally, taking off the streets the violent repeat career criminals.

Let me conclude by saying that I want to thank the original cosponsors of this bill, Senator ASHCROFT, Senator STEVENS, and Senator HATCH, and ask for additional cosponsors. I look forward to working with the Members of the Senate as we take these ideas that I presented today, this past week, presented in this bill, take these ideas, incorporate them with other ideas of my colleagues to come up with a final bill this year, or next year, that will in fact make a difference and will save lives, that will reduce crime.

Mr. President, thank you very much. At this point, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 338

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period of eligibility for inpatient care for veterans exposed to toxic substances, radiation, or environmental hazards, to extend the period of eligibility for outpatient care for veterans exposed to such substances or hazards during service in the Persian Gulf, and to expand the eligibility of veterans exposed to toxic substances or radiation for outpatient care.

S. 389

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill for the relief of Nguyen Quy An and his daughter, Nguyen Ngoc Kim Quy.

S. 433

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to regulate handgun ammunition, and for other purposes.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to phase out the use of mercury in batteries and provide for the efficient and cost-effective collection and recycling or proper disposal of used nickel cadmium batteries, small sealed lead-acid batteries, and certain other batteries, and for other purposes.

S. 641

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Idaho

[Mr. CRAIG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to reauthorize the Ryan White CARE Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] were added as cosponsors of S. 684, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs of research regarding Parkinson's disease, and for other purposes.

S. 689

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act regarding the use of organic sorbents in landfills, and for other purposes.

S. 770

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] were added as cosponsors of S. 770, a bill to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14—RELATIVE TO THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. MACK, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. D'AMATO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 14

Whereas the Panama Canal is a vital strategic asset to the United States, its allies, and the world;

Whereas the Treaty on the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal signed on September 7, 1977, provides that Panama and the United States have the responsibility to assure that the Panama Canal will remain open and secure;

Whereas such Treaty also provides that each of the two countries shall, in accordance with their respective constitutional processes, defend the Canal against any threat to the regime of neutrality, and consequently shall have the right to act against any aggression or threat directed against the Canal or against the peaceful transit of vessels through the Canal;

Whereas the United States instrument of ratification of such Treaty includes specific language that the two countries should consider negotiating future arrangements or agreements to maintain military forces necessary to fulfill the responsibility of the two countries of maintaining the neutrality of the Canal after 1999;

Whereas the Government of Panama, in the bilateral Protocol of Exchange of instruments of ratification, expressly "agreed upon" such arrangements or agreements;

Whereas the Navy depends upon the Panama Canal for rapid transit in times of emergency, as demonstrated during World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam conflict, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and the Persian Gulf conflict;